

Application No.: 09/980,910

Docket No.: NY-DNAG 224-US

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 27, 29-39 and 41-50 were rejected as allegedly obvious over Seidel in view of Reed. It is not believed that Seidel in view of Reed teaches or suggests every feature of any of the new independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the rejection must be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 27-35, 37, 39 and 42-49 were rejected as allegedly obvious over Cuyler. It is not believed that Cuyler teaches or suggests each and every limitation of the independent claims.

Claims 2 and 40 were rejected as allegedly obvious over the combination of Cuyler and Fotinos. It is not believed that Fotinos overcomes the deficiencies of Cuyler as set forth above.

In particular, claims 51 and 52 refer to the application of crystalline coatings on the metallic surfaces.

Claims 77 and 78 now recite ratios of cations to of P₂O₅ that are not believed to be obvious over the cited references.

Claims 82 and 83 recite, *inter alia*, the step of coating with a second phosphating solution.

In view of the foregoing, allowance is respectfully requested.


Application No.: 09/980,910

Docket No.: NY-DNAG 224-US

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-0624, under Order No. NY-DNAG 224-US.

Dated: July 6, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James R. Crawford
Registration No.: 39,155
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
666 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10103
(212) 318-3148
(212) 318-3400 (Fax)
Attorneys for Applicant